

JRW
AF

Patent
Attorney Docket No. 1033539-000021



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAIL STOP AF

Patent Application of

Ching Man Tsui et al.

Application No.: 10/829,431

Filing Date: April 22, 2004

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR TESTING SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES

Group Art Unit: 2829

Examiner: Russell Marc Kobert

Confirmation No.: 8776

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.
 Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the \$65.00 (2814) \$130.00 (1814) fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.
 Also enclosed is/are _____

Small entity status is hereby claimed.
 Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the \$395.00 (2801) \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).
 Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments not be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above.
 Applicant(s) previously submitted _____

on _____, for which continued examination is requested.
 Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least _____, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.
 A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed.

No additional claim fee is required.

An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$50.00 (1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$200.00 (1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)					
Total Claim Amendment Fee					
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					
\$ 0.00					

A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.

Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Charge _____ to credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: January 30, 2006

By 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **Mail Stop AF**
))
 Inventor: Ming Man Tsui et al.) Group Art Unit: 2829
))
Application No.: 10/829,431) Examiner: Russell Marc Kobert
))
Filed: April 22, 2004) Confirmation No.: 8776
))
For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR)
TESTING SEMICONDUCTOR)
DEVICES)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 28, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102, on the grounds that they were considered to be anticipated by the Tsurushima et al. patent, was maintained. Claims 6 and 7 were identified as containing allowable subject matter, which is noted with appreciation.

In reply to Applicants' previous response traversing this ground of rejection, the most recent Office Action takes the position that, since Applicants confirmed that the claims are not directed to the combination of a support apparatus and a leadframe with semiconductor devices, but rather to the support apparatus, per se, all references to the leadframe and/or semiconductor devices were not being given any weight in determining patentability. It is respectfully submitted that this is not the proper standard to be applied. As stated in the case of *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970), "All words in a claim must be considered in judging